

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

The End and Beginning of an Era

All of us share the temptation of allowing the jet stream of events—Iraq, Lebanon, Cuba, Berlin—to overwhelm our thinking and shape public opinion. To the extent that foreign policy is a practical down-to-earth endeavor, this contact with the real and the concrete is probably a sign of national health. Americans, however, are predisposed as a practical people to close their eyes to the broad trends and movements of history despite the forewarnings that are sounded by strong leaders in public and private life.

This was evident in the period around World War I when President Wilson cried out for programs that would reflect America's international responsibility. His optimism and even naïveté should not obscure his more enduring legacy. He endeavored valiantly, though without any immediate success, to rouse the public conscience to an awareness that abstention and isolation had lost their relevance, that the United States henceforth would be, for better or worse, a major factor in everything that transpired in world affairs. If Wilson conceived of world responsibility both too narrowly and too idealistically, if he assumed that the League and the U.S. in the League were ready to shoulder more burdens than proved possible, he at least caught a glimpse of the dawning of a new era and expressed this fearlessly.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt stood at another turning point in world affairs. The rise of Nazism had not been contained in Europe, the world balance of power was being shattered and only American power, affirmed and asserted, could preserve Western civilization. And as the conflict with Nazism drew to a close, Roosevelt prepared the way for the United Nations.

It fell to Mr. Truman to initiate policies aimed at resisting another threat to Western civilization. The Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine and NATO were the tripod on which resistance to Soviet expansion was based. The era from 1946 to 1955 was one of building up counter-forces as the most dependable means of holding back the Russian advance.

Obviously one period of history spills over into the next, and the years from 1955 to the present are both a continuation of the past and the preparation for a new era. At Geneva, the Soviet Union and the United States recognized in effect the nuclear stalemate. However popular it has become to speak of the 1955 summit conference as symbolic of broken promises, illusions and false smiles, history's hard lesson is that world politics at Geneva began to turn a corner, whether for better or for worse. Foreign policy has been more complicated since that time. Events in the non-Western world have gained in importance as the struggle between East and West has multiplied points of conflict. Cultural and intellectual barriers show signs of relaxation as the Soviet and Western worlds compete in this field. And in recent days, the scene of the Cold War, spurred by the Russian ultimatum over Berlin, has shifted once more to the diplomatic arena as the foreign ministers embark on the arduous task of preparing, if possible, for a summit conference. The last three or four years have thus been a transitional period.

Mr. Dulles faithfully lived and worked largely in the old era; yet he was also engaged in preparing the country for transition to the new. One of his most persistent critics, *The Economist* (London), paid him this honest tribute: "Who can doubt that

Vol. XIX, No. 11, June 22, 1959 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

when the story of the last six years comes to be written a singular share of the credit for the sustained resolution of the West's awkward squads of independent states in the face of the remorseless variety of the Soviet challenge will belong to Mr. Dulles' determination and intelligence?" Perhaps Mr. Dulles' greatest legacy is the will power, tenacity and resolve he provided when these qualities often seemed in short supply. In the words of a friendly overseas observer: "Of all the Eisenhower administration he will be remembered in history as the one big man."

Yet one of the ironies of history must be that Secretary Dulles will be measured and judged primarily in terms of the old era. He inherited and carried forward the practical assumptions of policies that were sufficient in the first decade following World War II. These included—and still include—the need for building up centers of military, economic and political power as a barrier against the flood of Soviet influence and power from the East. In the long run, both Mr. Dulles and his predecessor, Dean Acheson, hoped this might bring about changes in the Marxist reckoning of foreign relations. If the nations of the West had shown greater resolve in building up strength, the test of these expectations might have come earlier than it has. But as in the period between the two world wars, the "great slumbering giant," of which Mr. Churchill wrote in describing the West's response to another challenge, has never been fully aroused. Historians can speculate but we shall never fairly know what concessions the Soviets might have made had the West risen to the sacrifices necessary to strengthen its position in the manner called for by numerous private leaders in the Gaither and Rockefeller Reports.

Yet even in the absence up to now of a national response commensurate with the challenge, history has not stood still. Mr. Dulles' suggestions that German reunification was not necessarily dependent on free elections, at least as a first step, is symbolic of the West's relaxation of demands in the face of unfolding developments. The Soviet's seemingly more conciliatory position on nuclear controls is another, if quite different, symbol. The rise of new nations, the terrifying potential of modern weapons, the haunting specter of a number of small dictators brandishing such weapons and the acceleration of economic competition within and out-

side the two world empires has called for new approaches. World public opinion, conscious of these changes and filled with new hopes and fears, has set the stage for an inevitable series of diplomatic encounters that may go on for a generation or more.

These encounters are among the hallmarks of a new era, and with our British friends we may offer this final tribute to Mr. Dulles. His loss is the greater if we realize "that he who was so well equipped to negotiate a settlement on behalf of the West has had to end his service without achieving even the opportunity to try." K. W. T.

TV'S "SUNDAY BEST"

MUCH HAS BEEN SAID about the emptiness and triviality of most television programs—not least by such participants as Edward R. Murrow and David Susskind. This writer, who is no expert, discovered the truth of these criticisms after several weeks of illness taught him what television offers to those who look at programs every day.

The one commercial permitted here is that, in spite of all such criticisms, it is worthwhile to have a television set, if for no other reason than that it enables one to view many kinds of public events—political conventions, world series games, United Nations sessions, coronations, inaugurations and the McCarthy hearings, which made it so hard to do one's work.

In viewing only an occasional program one does not get the cumulative effect of the commercials. Perhaps it is good that they are in themselves so poorly done because they can be the more easily ignored. If many were as skillful as the Piel brothers they would be the more distracting. Commercials are a necessary evil and they are not the worst aspect of television, but the networks certainly saturate their programs with them. When will they begin to backfire and reduce interest in the medium they support?

The major problem of television is the lack of significant programs during most of the week. The charge that the good programs are reserved for Sunday is, for the most part, true. Many Sunday programs show how good the medium can be. There are a few good dramatic programs during the week; is it too much to expect the networks to come up to their "Sunday best" on other days?

This is not written with scorn for all the pop-

ular programs. This writer likes westerns and detective stories when he is tired, but one at a time is enough. Regardless of what some experts say about the psychological effect of television violence, it is hard to believe that it is good for people of any age to see it for hours, day after day, especially when the violence is in familiar settings. (More violence can be absorbed in westerns than in contemporary crime dramas.)

There are great obstacles in such a costly medium to securing adequate variety, including excellent programs that appeal to quite limited audiences or those that deal with controversial issues and risk offending particular groups. If it is this variety that we want, why should there not be both private and public networks? Both would have their faults, but they might be different faults; if so, there might be greater hope of freedom and variety.

A public monopoly would be most objectionable. However, even though there are several networks, the present tendency is toward a monopoly by one type of mind, that which fears the loss of customers. Some of the networks, notably CBS through its news staff, provide a partial corrective, but this is limited as is seen by the fact that some of the best CBS programs have been dropped for lack of sponsors.

Any large and costly enterprise will be afraid to offend either customers or voters. A public network, even if it were set up to have as much independence as the Supreme Court, would be subject to as strong attacks as the Court and would be fair game for Congressional committees. The BBC has behind it a tradition of independence that would be difficult to establish in this country where not even public or private universities are as free from public attack as they are in Britain. Should we not, however, at least experiment with various forms of control that will provide greater variety than we now have?

J. C. B.

A NEW LOOK AT THE SOBELL CASE

A GROUP of lawyers and religious leaders, including two of the editors of *Christianity and Crisis*, has recently petitioned the President for a commutation of the sentence of Martin Sobell, who is serving a thirty-year sentence in a Federal prison for his involvement in the Rosenberg case.

Sobell was a Communist and a friend of Rosenberg. There was, however, no evidence that he was involved in the treasonable transfer of atomic secrets. Only one witness testified that he had given Rosenberg industrial secrets. On being indicted, he

fled to Mexico and was forcibly returned to this country. His flight created further suspicion.

A separate trial should have been insisted upon at the beginning, but his lawyers failed to do so. Once the joint trial was undertaken, there was no way of preventing Sobell's involvement in the hysteria of the Rosenberg trial. Nor could an appeal secure for him a separate trial, except by the introduction of new evidence.

The committee that petitioned the President did not question the guilt and the fair trial of the Rosenbergs, nor for that matter did it declare its belief that Sobell was innocent of the charge on which he was convicted (though that charge was never fully aired in court and was supported by only one witness). It was the opinion of those signing the petition, however, that the sentence of 30 years was in any case excessive and that, even if guilty, Sobell, who has served seven of his thirty years, should be pardoned.

Another committee, headed by the chaplain of the prison where Sobell is incarcerated, has been organized to review, unofficially, the evidence in the trial. This project serves the useful purpose of acquainting the public with the issues, though it cannot have any influence on the juridical outcome.

Fortunately, justice in this nation is still administered by the exact rules of the courts. But even these exact rules can result in the miscarriage of justice, as for instance in the atmosphere of hysteria that surrounded the Rosenberg case. The petitioning committee feels that a commutation of the sentence, rather than a new trial, would be the best way of establishing for ourselves and proclaiming to the world that mercy is frequently necessary to supplement justice and to perfect the imperfections of the rules of justice, the very exactness of which may, on occasion, lead to a miscarriage of justice.

The committee does not challenge the Rosenberg decision; it believes that the defendants had a fair trial, at least as fair as the emotions of the period allowed. This writer, *not* necessarily the whole committee, is of the opinion that the Rosenbergs, though found guilty, should have had their death sentence commuted to life imprisonment, rather for moral and international-political reasons than for the exact purpose of justice. The Rosenbergs were fanatic Communists. From the perspective of the nation they were guilty of a grievous crime. In their own eyes and in the eyes of the Communists and fellow-travelers of the world, they were righteous martyrs of a great cause. R. N.

Labor, Management and the McClellan Committee

JOHN A. FITCH

WITH A FUND of \$750,000 to carry it through another twelve months, the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field started its third year of work in February. During its first two years the committee heard a host of witnesses, and the printed record to date fills more than 17,000 pages. The testimony has revealed an almost unbelievable amount of misuse or embezzlement of union funds by officers of certain unions, as well as less spectacular forms of misbehavior on the part of certain agents of management.

Public reaction has ranged from a shocked suspicion that most unions are corrupt to an attitude of cynical indifference and, on the part of a few, even defense of outrageous felonies. "If I were a truck driver," a young lawyer casually remarked, "I would not worry about the behavior of Jimmy Hoffa; I would remember how he boosted my wages." Noteworthy for its absence in general public discussion, though not overlooked by the unions, is a concern about "improper activities" on the part of management.

Before attempting to summarize the outstanding disclosures of the committee, the limits of the investigations should be noted. As of June, according to Robert Kennedy, counsel to the committee, "fifteen unions and more than fifty companies" had been found to be engaged in "improper activities" (*Life*, June 1). Thus it is evident that only a fraction of either labor or management has come under committee indictment.

The following is an attempt to set forth in brief compass some of the most significant of the facts revealed in the testimony.

Improper Activities Attributed to Labor

In its Interim Report issued in March 1957, the committee stated that it had "uncovered the shocking fact that union funds in excess of \$10,000,000 were either stolen, embezzled or misused by union officials over a period of fifteen years" for financial gain of themselves or their friends. Other disclosures, some of them equally disturbing, have emerged from the hearings.

The record of the Teamsters Union reveals an incredible degree of the most callous indifference

to moral scruple, as well as to their obligations to dues-paying-members, on the part of the highest officers in the union. The Interim Report states that Dave Beck, union president from 1952 to 1957 "took, not borrowed, more than \$370,000" from the union treasury, paying it back in part only after the Internal Revenue Service began to investigate.

Through an intermediary, bills to the extent of \$85,000 were charged to the union to meet the personal expenses of Beck, his son and various friends. The union treasury was drawn upon to pay landscape artists and florists to beautify the grounds about his house, and, ultimately, through action by the executive board, the union bought the house, paying Beck \$163,000 for it, and then turned it back to him, rent free.

Frank Brewster, a Teamster vice president, used union funds to maintain a racing stable.

James Hoffa, now president of the union, has "repeatedly betrayed the members of his own union," the Interim Report states, "by entering into a number of business relationships with employers with whom his union negotiated." His connection with and use of underworld characters have been among his most notorious activities.

Hoffa has a penchant for hiring ex-convicts and giving them positions of authority in the union. From a number of these he borrowed (or demanded) sums of money that he kept without suggestion of repayment and finally returned without interest on the eve of his appearance before the committee.

The pattern thus set by the Teamsters of thievery, squandering of union funds, shady business deals, violence—on the picket lines and to discourage revolts among the membership—has been followed, to some extent, by other unions studied. The secretary-treasurer of the Laundry Workers Union is mentioned in the Interim Report as having stolen \$900,000 from union and welfare funds. Two officers of the Textile Workers Union of America took \$57,000 from the union treasury with which to purchase homes and an additional \$17,000 for furnishings.

At the Bakery and Confectionery Workers' 1956 convention, President James G. Cross succeeded in having the constitution amended so as to give him the right to hire, fire and fix the salaries of inter-

Mr. Fitch has written widely in the area of industrial relations, his latest work being *The Social Responsibility of Organized Labor* (Harpers).

national representatives who constituted 75 per cent of the union's executive board. Soon after the convention this board met and, under its already existing power, raised the president's salary from \$17,500 to \$30,000. Cross then "returned the favor" by raising the salaries of the board members.

The committee found that George Stuart, a vice-president of the Bakers' Union, "mulcted Chicago locals of \$40,000." Of this, \$13,000, described on the union books as for a "joint organizational drive" with the Teamsters Union, actually was used for the purchase of "Cadillacs for Stuart and Cross."

Such thefts, the committee reported, were made possible because Stuart had been placed in complete control of the locals as trustee, with power to appoint and dismiss the officers.

And so the sordid story goes on. Cross and Stuart, to accommodate an employer from whom Cross had borrowed large sums of money, signed a substandard contract—against the will of the affected employees. Teamster officials in New York supported racketeer Johnny Dio in setting up phony locals through which "sweetheart" contracts were arranged that enabled employers to exploit their workers. Agents of Sheet Metal Workers locals in Chicago held up small contractors, compelling them to pay bribes for the right to do business. The Operating Engineers Union, whose constitution excludes half of its members from the right to vote for union officers, has carried disfranchisement further by placing locals under trusteeship. The members of two Chicago locals have thus been deprived of self-government for 29 years.

... and to Management

Some of the companies studied, according to the Interim Report, engaged in collusion with unions by paying their officials in order to get "favored treatment by way of 'sweetheart' contracts," or contracts imposing "substandard working conditions." Certain companies "have granted business concessions and loans to union leaders with whom they want to curry favor." Some management has used labor spies, discriminated against union sympathizers among their employees, "forced employees to join [favored] unions" without ascertaining their wishes "by arranging for 'top down' contracts"—all of which are illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Evidence supporting these charges referred, in the main, to small and medium-sized establishments, but the list included a few companies of considerable magnitude and importance. The Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company obtained certain advantages through a collusive agreement with

the Meat Cutters Union in New York City whereby interference with the free choice of a union by the employees was accomplished. Sears, Roebuck and Co. was also involved in a series of improper activities. A few weeks ago the committee heard testimony that certain New York newspapers made payments to labor racketeers to ensure deliveries to newsdealers during a truckmen's strike in 1948.

Some of the small employers have had improper practices forced upon them by threats or extortionist demands from crooks and have yielded in order to purchase labor "peace." This was notably true of the victims of the racketeering crew led by Johnny Dio in New York. Yet these employers are not entitled to complete absolution, for some of them were not blind to certain advantages to be obtained by yielding. The contracts they signed contained few provisions for improved wages or working conditions for their employees. Frequently the wage scale agreed to was simply the legal minimum of \$1 an hour.

A group of small employers from Flint, Michigan, told the committee how they had succeeded in resisting organizing efforts by the Teamsters Union. One after another, each of these employers sought the advice of a "labor counselor" who for a fee undertook to solve their difficulties. The fee consisted of a monthly "retainer" of \$75 to \$250 (graduated apparently according to the size of the pay roll) plus \$1,800 or more in a lump sum for "entertainment."

The counselor was not explicit about the purpose of the lump sum but said it was for "the boys." Under pressure from the committee members, most of the employers testified that they understood that "the boys" were Teamsters officers.

In every case, after engaging the "counselor," the union threat was removed. Harassing tactics ceased, pickets disappeared, organizers went elsewhere.

An employer who had thus been relieved of union pressure assured the committee that his payments had been "worthwhile." When asked if he was "perfectly happy" under the arrangement, he replied, "I think so."

George Kamenov, the "counselor" referred to above, who hid behind the Fifth Amendment when called before the committee, was a member of the staff of Labor Relations Associates, Inc. The firm was established in 1939 by Nathan W. Shefferman, who was described as a "labor relations man for Sears, Roebuck" at that time. Having been assisted financially in its initial stages by Sears, the agency grew rapidly and in 1956 was said to have upwards

of 400 employer clients. Of the 40 "top money" clients in the list, 23 were using the agency to keep unions out of their plants or to install "friendly unions."

How both methods could be used in the same plant is illustrated by the experience of Morton Frozen Food Co. of Webster City, Iowa. The Shefferman firm helped to defeat the Packing House Workers Union in their efforts to organize the plant. Having done this, it then cooperated with the company in bringing in the Bakery and Confectionery Workers as bargaining representatives of the employees. Through misrepresentation the employees were led to accept the union and a contract that had been drawn up in the Shefferman office and signed by the officers of the company and the national officers of the union. There was no consultation with the employees who were affected by it.

As this indicates, and as the Interim Report stated, "Shefferman not only was used to keep unions out but was a specialist in finding a friendly union, one the employer could 'live with.'" The Report lists a group of important companies, including Sears, for which Shefferman rendered these services. The latter firm, which has since severed its connection with Industrial Relations Associates and repudiated its tactics, paid Shefferman "some \$78,000" for "preventing a legitimate unionization" of their Boston store.

From the establishment of Industrial Relations Associates in 1939 until the severance of its relationship with Sears in 1956, Shefferman, despite his anti-union activities, was on very friendly terms with certain prominent union officials. He cultivated these relationships in order to promote the "public relations phases" of his work. Among labor men with whom Shefferman established friendly relations, his closest ties in recent years had been with Dave Beck, of whom he told the committee: "I have known Mr. Beck for more than 20 years. [He] has been a friend and a very good friend . . . He is very attentive to his friends and very generous to his folks and people who surround him . . . a terrific personality and a very fine gentleman."

Remedial Efforts

With respect to management's attitude toward derelictions within its own ranks, it should be noted that two employing concerns of very great importance have "confessed error" and made public apologies—Sears, Roebuck and *The New York Times*. The latter stated in an editorial: "*The Times* would not today under any circumstances agree to

reimburse any of its contractors for payments to union officials." It should also be realized that the instances cited of misbehavior on the part of management are far less heinous than the outrages that have been perpetrated by some of the officers of unions.

Nevertheless some of management's activities, when viewed without comparisons, are serious indeed and offensive to good conscience. It is this fact that makes the failure of any of the major representative business organizations to condemn or suggest measures for correcting management misbehavior a serious matter. Such groups or their spokesmen have not failed to express themselves vigorously with respect to legislation that they feel is needed to punish wrongdoing on the part of the unions.

Organized labor, as represented by the AFL-CIO, acting through its Ethical Practices Committee and its major administrative and legislative bodies, has taken steps toward cleaning up or throwing out the worst elements within its ranks. Three unions—the Teamsters, the Bakers and the Laundry Workers—have been expelled. The United Textile Workers Union was suspended until its corrupt officers were dismissed and other reform action was taken; two other small unions, the Allied Industrial Workers and the Distillery Workers, were placed on probation, pending action by their conventions requested by the AFL-CIO. The Ethical Practices Committee and the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO are continuing their investigation of the Carpenters Union.

The only final action possible to the parent body is expulsion—it cannot exact specific penalties. That expulsion in itself is no guarantee of reform is evidenced by the experience of the Teamsters Union, which has retained most of its corrupt officers and is said to have increased its membership since expulsion.

The agencies possessing the requisite power for dealing with the offenses and crimes uncovered by the committee are governmental. State and Federal law enforcement bodies have made a limited and seemingly reluctant attack. Robert Kennedy states that "the federal government has obtained convictions of only three individuals."

The one case where reasonably prompt action has been taken is in the state of Washington where Dave Beck was convicted of grand larceny in a state court and of income tax evasion in a federal court, with combined sentences of twenty years in prison and a fine of \$60,000. There have been a few in-

(Continued on page 96)

DRAMA

TENNESSEE WILLIAMS: Geographer of Hell

Seeing a Tennessee Williams play is like being handed an armful of electric eels. You may not know quite what to do about it but you know you have had a memorable experience. His latest, *Sweet Bird of Youth*, for example, alternately jolts and repels with an intensity audiences will long remember.

The story deals with two disintegrating lives intertwined by the accident of a seaside pickup and the urgency of their mutual needs—Chance Wayne, a fading aspirant actor, and Ariadne Del Lago, a Hollywood has-been in frantic flight from herself. Chance is clawing desperately for the top and fame. Ariadne is seeking to forget a wrecked career by drink, drugs and sex. Each seeks to use the other to accomplish his aims.

Chance takes the disturbed actress to his small southern hometown to use her name and influence to re-establish himself as the local idol. He wants to marry Heavenly, his childhood sweetheart (whom he has infected with a venereal disease necessitating a hysterectomy), against the wishes of her father, a racist political boss.

The two plots are: the struggle of Ariadne to survive as a person and artist in a jungle-world that rejects her; and the struggle of Chance to become a demigod (movie star), to vindicate himself by saving Heavenly and to escape the vengeance of her father and brother. Ariadne wins her struggle and returns triumphant to the land of the "Ogres"—Chance loses and faces castration and death as the curtain falls.

The production is directed by Elia Kazan with a fluid intensity that makes this personal nightmare almost too intimate an experience to bear. The dramatic action flows freely across differing stage levels delineated only by diaphanous sets and area lighting. This creates an open, oceanic effect that heightens the vivid "waking dream" quality of the play. One felt, especially at the end of the second act, the entire audience trembling on the verge of waking up screaming.

The performances are all excellent and reflect the drive and bravura of the direction. Geraldine Page creates an ogress to remember, and Paul Newman, acting against his type, movingly communicates the pathetic death of a cafe-society darling. Rip Torn, Sidney Blackmer and others etched indelible personal images on the mind of the audience.

Chance seeks to storm heaven with his vital maleness; his pathetic frenzy spends itself in mutilation and death. He has gambled and lost. Ariadne, with a female rhythm of receiving and giving back (birth), scores a transient victory over "the enemy time." She is granted a gratuitous apotheosis. To her is given all the immortality to be had in a finite, dying world—the immortality of the artist who

transmutes ugliness into beauty, suffering into revelation. (The audience is not led to hope that this rare gift can be theirs; they are the Chances of the world, spending themselves in futility. "I do not ask for your pity... just for your recognition of me in you....") The creator's gift to transcend time is the only light in the darkness of Mr. Williams' world, but it is a light. *Veni, creator spiritus!*

Sweet Bird mercilessly reveals the bankruptcy of the paganism that passes for the American Way of Life with only feeble attempts to hide behind slogans about God. The gross (but slickly merchandized) materialism and the cynical *mystique de jeunesse* that pervades American thinking is brought to a painful focus. Little wonder that there has been some violent reaction to the play.

The twin threats of "the enemy time" and man's unaccountable perverseness have always challenged humanism's hopes. The only recourse is to deny their reality and to assert man's control of himself as, for example, Marya Mannes does in her review in *The Reporter*. Miss Mannes may not sink to drink, dope or sexual excess but many have, do and will. And not the least among men, either. The fact of sin is as true for the pharisee as for publican. After the shades of gray of liberal humanism, it is almost a relief to look into the violent contrasts of Tennessee Williams' pagan world.

Thus, much of the negative reaction to Tennessee Williams arises because his plays are a dynamic affront to deeply accepted presuppositions of the sufficiency and original righteousness of man. Few humanists can bear to see the wreck of their beliefs so poignantly stated. On the other hand, the Christian can see and accept the worst about man because his certitude rests in the perfection of the Creator, not in the perfectability of the creature.

As for the future of Tennessee Williams, I hazard a guess that this play may well make an end to his savage studies of perversity and violence. It seems to me that Mr. Williams has hurled himself headlong down a philosophical and artistic dead-end. Now there must come some kind of self-transcendence (these miracles of grace are not so rare), or the rest is silence.

He has never been a regional writer. He is not a southern writer or even a writer about the South. (Interesting to note is the total absence of a single convincing Negro in any of his major plays.) His frame is universal. He affects so deeply because he is a man on a pilgrimage through his unconscious, which is in some electrifying areas the unconscious of us all. This pilgrimage may stall in a private hell or it may proceed out of the depths to a new level of wholeness and integrity in which we can all participate. I do not believe it will stall.

Whatever happens, it is the most absorbing tour now being offered by any living dramatist I know of—South, North, East or West. And after all, in an age that has lost its way, directions even from a geographer of Hell must not be despised. To know Hell and its dimensions may well be the first faltering step toward Heaven.

Mr. Lanier is an Episcopal clergyman closely related to the theatre.

SIDNEY LANIER

LABOR-MANAGEMENT

(Continued from page 94)

dictments in state courts and some convictions, but in the main—to quote Kennedy again—"there is appalling public apathy."

Federal courts are unable to deal with most of the cases because of lack of appropriate legislation. To remedy this situation the Labor Committee of the Senate presented a bill, known as the Kennedy-Ervin bill, to empower the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Labor to act effectively against most of the offenses uncovered by the committee.

This bill, if enacted into law, will set up substantial roadblocks to various forms of corruption and will protect the voting rights of members. The bill requires unions to make detailed reports of their financial affairs; union officers must report any financial dealing that might create a conflict of interest. Embezzlement of union funds is made a federal crime.

Employers are required to report expenditures for industrial espionage, and both employers and management consultants will be obliged to report expenditures intended to influence employees with respect to their bargaining rights or to oppose the exercise of such rights.

Strict rules are set up to prevent the evils that have emerged with respect to placing locals under trusteeship. Election of officers must be held at regular intervals, and local officers and convention delegates must be elected by secret ballot. The right of union members to assemble to discuss union affairs is asserted, and members can be disciplined only under due process procedures.

The bill, with amendments, passed the Senate with a single vote in opposition. It is now before the House where it is being opposed, for different reasons, by labor and management bodies. The outlook for the enactment this year of a law that will curb the activities that clearly constitute a national scandal appears to be dim.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

PLEASE PRINT all changes of address, giving zone number where possible. Allow three weeks for change to take effect.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
27462 11-59

CORRESPONDENCE

A Word for Father Weigel

TO THE EDITORS: Father Weigel ("Inside American Roman Catholicism," June 8) displays a mentality that we in POAU have grown accustomed to when he speaks snidely of our organization and attempts to pass it off with a sneer. It is, alas, the attitude of a man—and a church—so smug and insulated that it cannot even conceive that there could be any validity to concerns and questions that millions deeply feel.

Fr. Weigel thinks we don't represent Protestants. Well, who does? You can be very sure about this, Fr. Weigel: that on certain specific issues involving the separation of Church and State we have spoken for a lot of Protestants—a whole lot of them. Also for many Jews and a smaller number of Roman Catholics who are in our membership.

Contemplate this: for the past twelve years our membership and readership have uninterruptedly grown, month by month, and our orbit of committees, chapters and cooperating groups has steadily and impressively expanded. Why? There is a reason, Fr. Weigel, and not all of it lies on the opposite side of the fence from you.

Incidentally, Fr. Weigel, one reason why Roman Catholics are so ignorant of Protestant worship and belief, a fact you so well deplore, is the rule of your church that forbids them to visit a Protestant service or read Protestant books. Makes intercommunication difficult.

C. STANLEY LOWELL
Associate Director, POAU
Washington, D.C.

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT McAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

LABOR, MANAGEMENT AND THE McCLELLAN COMMITTEE
JOHN A. FITCH
DRAMA: *Sweet Bird of Youth*
SIDNEY LANIER